DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 506 SP 015 396

AUTHOR	Arends, Richard: And Others
TITLE	Conditions for Promoting Effective Staff Development.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 80
CONTRACT	400-78-0017
NOTE	42p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Learning: *Change Strategies: *Inservice Teacher Education: Needs Assessment: *Professional Development: Program Design: *Staff Improvement: Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The complexities of designing and operating inservice education programs are examined. This publication is organized into four major areas. Chapter one defines the interrelated series of current staff development activities as observed by the authors. Chapter two contains findings that have influenced thinking about the problems discussed in the first chapter and strategies for resolving them. Chapter three presents a relational series of conditions or guidelines for staff development providers. Chapter four anticipates issues that demand consideration, research that remains to be done, and practices that should be furthered. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183506

CONDITIONS FOR PROMOTING EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Richard Arends and Richard Hersh

University of Oregon

and

Jack Turner

Bethel-Eugene-Springfield Teacher Center

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

February 1980 SP 015 396

SP 015 396

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is funded by the National Institute of Education. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to a referee for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Clearinghouse, or the National Institute of Education.

* * *

Quotations in this monograph taken from Theory Into Practice (vol. 17, no. 3, June 1978) are used by permission. Copyright 1978, College of Education, The Ohio State University.

CONTENTS

Foreword. v

Introduction. 1

CHAPTER I: REVERSING THE TELESCOPE ON A COMPLEX PROBLEM. 3

Roles of the Classroom Teacher: Finite and Infinite. 4
A Quest for Certainty 5
Role of the Teacher in Staff Development. 8
The Unconsidered Paradigm Transfer. 9
Staff Development Courses 13
Teachers and School Organization. 13
Nature of Schools 14

CHAPTER II: CONCEPTS, RESEARCH, EXPERIENCES, HUNCHES 15

Nature of Adult Learners. 15
Organizational Development. 16
Politics of Staff Development 16
Purposes of Staff Development 18
Summary 21

CHAPTER III: GUIDELINES FOR INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION. 22

Nature of Adult Learners. 22
Human Interaction 23
Organizational Development. 26
Planned Change. 28
Cyclical Nature of Planned Change 29

CHAPTER IV: IMAGES AND ORGANIZATION FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT. 32

Local Education Agencies. 32
State Education Agencies. 32
Institutions of Higher Education. 33
Changing the Images 34

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 35

FOREWORD

The literature on inservice education of teachers abounds with descriptions of programs and practices, and it is expanding at an accelerating rate. Conspicuously scarce in that body of literature, however, are theoretical treatments and research reports on the subject.

Much of what is happening in inservice education today reflects a patchwork approach to the problem. If inservice education programs are to have the desired results, they must be viewed as complex undertakings and be built on a sound theoretical base.

The authors of this monograph examine the complexities of designing and operating inservice education programs, suggest solutions to a number of the problems encountered in planning such programs, and call particular attention to contextual conditions that must be addressed. This paper is not another program description; it is a theoretical treatment of the subject, and we believe that it will help to fill the gap in the literature about inservice education. For background, it is suggested that readers refer to the June 1978 issue of Theory Into Practice (vol. 17, no. 3), for which the authors served as guest editors. Copies may be purchased from 149 Arps Hall, 1945 N. High St., Columbus, OH, 43210.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is disseminating this document to stimulate dialogue on an important topic in teacher education--the continuing professional development of practicing teachers. Readers are invited to comment on this monograph and to submit related documents to the Clearinghouse for possible inclusion in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system. Documents may include project descriptions, curriculum guides, instructional materials, conference speeches, and other nonjournal materials. For details, write to the Senior Information Analyst, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 616, Washington, DC, 20036.

The Clearinghouse acknowledges with appreciation the contributions of the authors for writing this manuscript, of Sharon G. Boardman for providing technical editing services and supervision, and Robert J. Gillette Jr. for production.

KARL MASSANARI, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education

INTRODUCTION

> ...And so when I hear so much impatient and irritable complaint, so much readiness to replace what we have by guardians for us all, those supermen, evoked somewhere from the clouds, whom none have seen and none are ready to name, I lapse into a dream, as it were. I see children playing on the grass, their voices are shrill and discordant as children's are; they are restive and quarrelsome, they cannot agree to any common plan; their play annoys them; it goes so poorly. And one says, let us make Jack the master; Jack knows all about it, Jack will tell us what each is to do and we shall all agree. But Jack is like all the rest; Helen is discontented with her part and Henry with his, and soon they fall into their old state. No, the children must learn to play by themselves; there is no Jack The Master. And in the end slowly and with infinite disappointment they do learn a little; they learn to forbear, to reckon with another, accept a little where they wanted much, to live and let live, to yield when they must yield; perhaps, we may hope, not to take all they can. But the condition is that they shall be willing at least to listen to one another, to get the habit of pooling their wishes. Somehow or other they must do this, if the play is to go on; maybe it will not, but there is no Jack, in or out of the box, who can come to straighten the game.
>
> from "Children Playing"
> by Justice Learned Hand

Staff development, an exceedingly complex notion, can be productively "reckoned with" if the participants can come to understand and behave according to the complexities involved. Despite Justice Learned Hand's words to the contrary, that "there is no Jack, in or out of the box, who can come to straighten the game," we propose to at least clarify the "game," if not straighten it.

This publication is organized into four major areas: Chapter one attempts to define the interrelated series of current staff development activities as we understand them. Chapter two contains findings that have influenced our thinking about the problems explicit in chapter one, and about strategies for resolving them. Chapter three presents a relational series of conditions or guidelines for staff development providers. This series is derived from research and local experience. Chapter four anticipates issues that demand consideration, research that remains to be done, and practices that should be furthered.

We are cautiously optimistic. The present state of staff development is unhealthy, but needn't remain so. As argued throughout this paper, more productive staff development begins with the recognition that the concept is complex. Attempts to impose activities or to import context-free delivery systems cannot work; there are no simple answers to complex problems.

CHAPTER I

REVERSING THE TELESCOPE ON A COMPLEX PROBLEM

Defining "inservice" or "staff development" has been a chronic problem for professional educators. When broadly conceived, the definitions seem vacuous with no operational validity. In narrow terms the definitions connote finiteness, a sense of discreteness that rings untrue to experienced educators. A precise definition eludes us because the family of concepts required to define staff development are themselves complex, and when combined result in ambiguity. Yet ambiguity need not be decried; we have learned to live with that same characteristic in several older concepts, that is, thinking, teaching, learning, which are all basic pieces of the larger concept of staff development. Rather than invite the doctrinal skirmishes inevitable in trying to lock in an adequate definition of staff development, we yield to Polonyai's notion of "tacit knowledge." He suggested that we may know or recognize something tacitly without being able to describe it.

It seems as if most people are satisfied with their understanding of what staff development is--what it is supposed to do, what its assumptions are, and how it operates. Staff development is an operational reality; the notion itself is established and stable, even if chronically frustrating to its participants. We propose that the frustration with the established notion of staff development springs from a discrepancy between participant expectations and the behaviors played out by the teachers, administrators, trainers, professors, and others who participate in the enterprise. We believe that this discrepancy springs from the very stability and acceptance of the traditional staff development model, which is itself at odds with much of what we know about adult learning and cognitive development. It appears to be inevitable that if staff development providers and participants continue to behave as they traditionally have, their expectations will remain unmet.

We are intrigued by the analogy of reversing a telescope. Imagine that a group of people have discovered the telescope and accepted it as a tool to improve their vision. However, the inventor and all subsequent users looked through the telescope backwards, thereby making things look farther away instead of nearer. This imaginary group insisted the telescope was a potentially valuable tool, but they failed to turn it around and see how things looked from the other end. The people remained chronically frustrated because their tool did not help them see as they thought it should. They just kept using it in hopes that, somehow, it would.

One premise of this paper is that the conceptual lens one uses to define a view of staff development later delimits what one may conclude are conditions for promoting effective staff development. On examining the traditional conceptual lens used in viewing staff development, we find it to be lacking, and we suggest reversing the telescope in the hope of increasing clarity and depth of vision.

A variety of forces and conditions combine to render staff development a demanding enterprise. The components are relatively easy to isolate and name: needs assessment, delivery systems, and reward structures. Yet the focus on components has diverted attention away from the way they interact. Staff development is more than the sum of its separate components.

Roles of the Classroom Teacher: Finite and Infinite

Teaching innovations and school organization improvements require time-consuming changes on the part of teachers. To illustrate, in simpler times a teacher's main task was to impart basic knowledge and skills. However, the teaching role expanded as society increased both the time allocated for education and its expectations for educated persons. As the role expanded, the teacher's work and responsibilities extended far beyond the time available. Increased class size and larger schools; more requirements for credentials; public demand for results; legislated curriculum demands such as education for handicapped children; career education, sex education, and moral education, as well as the fear of re-educating a teaching staff, have combined to place educators in a difficult situation. Parkinson's law that work expands to fill the time available for its completion does not apply to the teacher's world. Teaching is a much more subtle phenomenon than that to which Parkinson speaks.

Teachers and administrators, as workers everywhere who are accountable to higher authority, share a common belief that beyond trying to produce or induce something, they are obligated to show their results to whomever they feel accountable. The limitation of Parkinson's law is that it makes no distinction between the two categories of a teacher's work. The range of activities that make up a teacher's day can be classified as finite (capturable in numbers and precise language) and infinite. The finite category includes, taking lunch counts, administering achievement tests, recording at-task behaviors, filling out forms, developing grading curves, counting the days until school is out, and so on. The infinite category includes all of the indeterminate things, such as stimulating class discussions, debating educational issues, mediating conflicts between students, striving to teach decency, appreciation and other values, pausing to wonder why--sometimes just pausing to wonder. If our position is valid, we begin to see that a teacher's strategy for coping with accountability results in an excess of finite activities being performed at the expense of the infinite--and ultimately at the expense of students and the profession. Turner's corollary may best explain this coping strategy:

> When a teacher is faced with a complex of tasks, both finite and infinite, the amount of time devoted to the finite is proportionate to the degree of outside pressure perceived for production.

An example may illuminate the proposition. Several years ago a middle-size urban school district selected one master teacher for each elementary school, and freed these teachers from classroom assignments. This new "resource teacher" would be on call to assist colleagues. The position was left relatively unstructured to encourage the resource teacher to work wherever needed--demonstration teaching, observing, locating resources for colleagues, tutoring, and in general spreading those teaching qualities for which the person was chosen as resource teacher. Within five years the project folded, because the resource teachers had turned away from their original, largely infinite roles and moved into finite roles. The latter could be easily understood, and defended if necessary. The resource teachers had become de facto administrative assistants to their principals, librarians, or any of several other functions that all had more distinct beginnings and endings.

The impetus behind this transformation was as simple as it was powerful: The school board and the central administration's interest in the program was perceived by the resource teachers, rightly or wrongly, as pressure to produce, to show demonstrable results in any way possible. Consequently, the resource teachers shifted away from the infinite in favor of activities that could be counted.

A Quest for Certainty

The education of children and the continuing education of teachers constitute an enterprise that is extremely susceptible to doubt and uncertainty. For example, most teachers wonder if they are as competent or as inadequate as their evaluators perceive them to be. There is no objective measure that would clarify universally what good teaching is and who makes a good teacher. Many would-be measures--direct instruction, research and development on teaching, performance contracting, achievement testing, voucher system, competency-based education, and others--are confusing the issue, but the common genesis of each is the desire to settle the questions, what are the essential components of instructional excellence, and which teachers have mastered them?

If we could observe the dilemma with detachment, we submit that we should be incredulous. Perhaps two million teachers devote their professional lives to an endeavor about which there is little certainty. And untold millions more citizens hold distinct, individual values about what constitutes proper schooling and good teaching. In those jobs where a person works with tangible things (air traffic controllers, cabinet makers, salespeople, et cetera) it is relatively simple to determine the essential components of the job and to judge who has mastered them. For example, ten people randomly chosen off the street could examine a cabinet maker's work and be likely to agree, perhaps unanimously, on the apparent quality. Yet after observing a given teacher, those same ten observers might judge quite differently the apparent quality of instruction. This disagreement happens often--and not only among observers off the street.

Given the ambiguous context in which teaching occurs, it is predictable that teachers and administrators will search for ways to objectively establish and validate competence, and to show the results to whomever they perceive to be watching. The most used method in our culture for demonstrating accountability invariably consists of paperwork and numbers. If we can quantify the behaviors and experiences in the teaching/learning process, presumably we can communicate them better to whomever we must account. Further, these <u>tangible</u>, <u>quantified</u>, <u>finite</u> results will satisfy everyone that children are learning in school.

Perhaps the greatest danger of finite quantification is that activities that can be made finite take on the appearance of understandable, simple causality. If we can measure a process from beginning to end, we can understand it, replicate it, and feel a sense of accomplishment when the result comes out as anticipated. The process can become a learned pattern that may be summoned whenever appropriate cues are presented. Undoubtedly, there are countless worthwhile applications of this causality notion, some of which may save our lives. Advocates of the finite would prefer that all significant teaching/learning processes be recast as finite on the belief that

once quantifiable, it becomes possible to comprehend, describe, evaluate, disseminate, and replicate a process.

The Bethel-Eugene-Springfield Teacher Center (BEST Center) sponsored a training series on discipline for early adolescents. A presenter was hired on the recommendation of a review panel of teachers that his training was both well-organized and appropriate to the topic. The post-training evaluations by the participants were positive; most teachers indicated that they found the relevance they were looking for, and their evaluations seemed to affirm the review panel's judgment. However, a closer analysis of the teacher evaluations clarifies the warning about the appearance of understandable, simple causality.

Without question, discipline in schools is a major concern, and everybody agrees that discipline should somehow be better. Teachers are crowding into classes of the type sponsored by the BEST Center to find out how to "make it better." As the evaluations testify, growing numbers of teachers are convinced that good classroom discipline is a product of finite secrets. Where the evaluation form solicits ideas and needs for further training, teachers most frequently call for more tips, more simple causal strategies. The belief embedded in their comments is that somewhere there exists a relatively simple, learnable, patterned response that, once mastered, will prove immediately useful in times of need.

A childhood anecdote amplifies the point. A wayward high school student, Jack never developed what his teachers referred to as "study habits." His older sister obviously had excellent "study habits" because she spent a lot of time studying at home and made straight A's. At eight week intervals (corresponding with the arrival of report cards), Jack always vowed to look into these touted "study habits," but he was never able to recognize what he saw. He was convinced that "study habits" were something magical and finite that he didn't yet know how to do. All inquiries to his sister ended in frustration for both of them. Jack was unable to ferret out the secret to study habits, and resented his sister for refusing to share it. His sister thought that Jack had brushed off her best attempts to teach him the complexities of good study habits. Much later Jack learned that there was no trick. His sister had tried to acquaint him with the complex attitudes (perseverance) and skills (outlining), the sum total of which is called "study habits," but Jack had insisted there was something more, something clever. There is not.

The same disappointing truth holds for numerous aspects of teaching and learning. Returning to the topic of discipline, when a teacher has no discipline problems in the classroom, the first reaction of colleagues is that the teacher must possess a finite strategy for quelling problems. By questioning the teacher or observing the class, other teachers think that the secret strategy will be revealed, but all they will see is the same thing that Jack saw when he spied on his sister--nothing and everything. Questions and observations may refresh one's memory about conventional strategies that can be used; but while the model teacher can command silence in the classroom by merely lowering her voice, the same trick added to another teacher's repertoire produces nothing. Alas, the understandable, simple causality is elusive once again.

To resort to the finite is to expect that the process, which one is trying to influence or control, is simple and one-dimensional. In cases where the process is indeed relatively simple and unidimensional, the attractive causality of the finite strategy is generally appropriate. If we want

something to happen we select the appropriate strategy and it happens as anticipated. Or if it doesn't happen this time, we can identify the interference. A finite process is almost scientific in its orderly progression and predictability. For education, the appeal of the finite is that it promises to move all the important elements of teaching/learning into the science of causality. Elements that cannot be measured and made discrete either will be diminished in importance and neglected or will be warped into fitting the paradigm, such as happened in a recent workshop on developing performance indicators for an elementary art program.

The push toward the finite explains much of experienced teachers' desires for more hands-on workshops, idea swaps, make-and-take sessions, and for no more theoretical "ivy-tower" courses. Direct instruction now marches frontally across the educational landscape because it has demonstrated the very quality of understandable, simple causality that we all hoped existed somewhere. To the extent that direct instruction works, it has a place in a teacher's instructional repertoire. Our quarrel does not reside with using finite strategies; it resides instead with the assumption that all of the significant aspects of the teaching/learning process can be translated to finite strategies. A teacher who succeeds in filling the instructional day with ever more finite strategies may be said to have mastered the science of teaching but failed the art of teaching. The reality of teaching intensifies the teacher's search for finite solutions. Whether a teacher spends all day in an elementary classroom with the same group of students or in a secondary classroom with five or six different groups, that teacher has little time for adult interaction. Not only are teachers generally isolated from peers, but they are isolated in an intense, demanding environment. According to Joyce (1976), teachers are second only to air traffic controllers in the amount of daily stimuli they receive (one stimulus every eight seconds). The moments between classes, a hurried lunch period often spent supervising students, and perhaps one "free" hour per day do not provide time for a refreshing break, or for sustained professional dialogue with its potential for energizing one with new ideas, excitement and plans, and for reinforcing one's known successes. Sarason (1971) pointed out that teachers' contact with children is not only different from contact with peers, but it also produces "loneliness." As a result, teachers are psychologically alone and adapt to being alone although they operate in densely populated, and hurried settings.

The following anecdote symbolizes this aloneness. A frustrated parent commented, "I want to show interest in my child's schooling, but when I ask her what happened in school today, she always replies, 'Oh, not much.'" An insightful listener, on hearing this common plaint, suggested that if the tables were turned and the daughter became questioner regarding what had happened in her mother's life today, the mother's response would likely be much the same. The alternative is an extended dialogue that would create a context for recounting noteworthy events.

This tale may explain, in part, the lonely teacher phenomenon and suggest how to reduce the loneliness: (1) Tired teachers act out the parts of mother and daughter in the faculty lounge after school. (2) There is no possibility for a substantive dialogue unless both parties have sufficient time to develop and nurture it. (3) The end of a workday is probably the worst possible time to interact with others except superficially. (4) The amount of time for context building that is necessary for full comprehension on the part of a listener is inversely proportional to the closeness of organizational linkages

between two people (i.e., if the mother works in the school, a full reply from the daughter might consume only one hour instead of three).

How can teachers work interdependently to carry out the mission of schools if organizational structures within the school dictate aloneness?

Role of the Teacher in Staff Development

For considering the teacher's role in traditional staff development, we return to the metaphor of the telescope. The first step in reversing the conceptual telescope is to look at some specific aspects of staff development. Table 1 summarizes the main features of traditional staff development.

TABLE 1

TRADITIONAL FEATURES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Features of Staff Development	Traditional Locus of Control		
	Teachers	Administration	University
Who pays?	Occasionally	Usually	Occasionally
Who communicates?		Usually	Occasionally
Who decides content?		Occasionally	Usually
Who decides setting (context)?		Usually	Occasionally
Who designs evaluation?		Occasionally	Occasionally
Who chooses audience?		Usually	Occasionally
Who assesses needs?		Usually	Occasionally
Who sets priorities?	Occasionally	Usually	

Teachers, for whose benefit (growth, remediation, et cetera) staff development is generally accepted to be, have a singularly passive role in its creation and delivery. Why has a system that has been in place for so long, that has been so widely accepted, and that has allowed its beneficiaries so comfortable a role become condemned as inadequate and unfulfilling?

Perhaps a major part of the answer comes from "rising expectations," which means an increase on the part of teachers in the qualitative expectations of any given staff development experience. (Heretofore, the

expectations generally came from the central administration and more recently the public; these could at least appear to be met by a quantitative barrage of additional inservice offerings.) The assumption that staff development needs can continue to be met by ever increasing numbers of events is flawed. If the basic problem stems from the misuse of the telescope's properties, providing more telescopes will not help the situation. If anything, "more," be it telescope or staff development activities, won't be likely to meet the increasing frustration and impatience with the tool.

If increased quantity leads only to increased frustration, the other obvious variable to examine is increased quality, which has more than one dimension. We believe that most inservice presenters generally do the best job they can. The dilemma resides in the high probability that instruction designed for a group of teachers about whose background the provider is essentially ignorant is likely to be either inapplicable or redundant. The content delivered may be of exceptional quality, but if it does not fit into each classroom context, if it is something the teacher already knows, or if it exceeds the breadth of the teacher's original interest, it will be perceived as unhelpful. Meanwhile, the teacher audience files passively out the door, and an objective evaluator concludes that the presentation was brilliantly conceived and delivered. In essence, those staff development managers have a degree of discretionary power over their teacher-clients, which normally only parents are allowed over children. As a result, they have stunted and made dependent those whom they intended to help.

If teachers remain as dependent in staff development activities as they have been traditionally, then staff development will not change from what we now have. Traditional staff development is doing about as well as can be expected, unless and until its users take a more active role in it. Important dimensions of the "quality" criterion have to do with assertiveness (don't misread as militancy), control (don't misread as militancy), ownership of responsibility (don't misread...), and influencing one's environment. If a person or work group uses these elements as an approach to staff development, three things are more likely to happen: They will become even more interested than before in the quality issue; they will be much more likely to find quality in what they create; and they will probably become more confident that they can locate resources and influence their own learning environments in productive ways. These results are not commonly achieved, and the reasons for failure are only partially attributable to teachers' dependent position in the traditional staff development model. The following sections present other factors working against effective staff development as usually practiced.

The Unconsidered Paradigm Transfer

Traditional staff development is a perfect example of the consequences of transferring a paradigm without sufficient regard for the nature of the client population to which the paradigm is being assigned (Arends, Hersh, and Turner, 1978). Historically, many of the designs and delivery mechanisms for staff development have emanated from the same place and the same perspective as preservice education--colleges of education. It is not surprising that preservice and inservice education have much in common. Table 2 compares the essential attributes of the two and should make clear our assertion that the paradigm for training new teachers has been transferred almost intact to provide staff development to veteran teachers.

TABLE 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING

Attributes	Preservice Training	Inservice Training
Client needs assessed by others	Yes	Usually
Client needs attributed by others	Yes	Usually
Skills acquisition the primary focus	Yes	Yes
Classroom-like training setting	Yes	Usually
Linear and discrete presentation of subject at hand	Yes	Yes
Length of training period dictates scope and depth	Yes	Yes
Training possible only when a minimum number of clients sign up	Yes	Yes
Training designed by the trainer	Yes	Usually
Clients go to trainer, not vice versa	Yes	Yes
Client treated as an individual, not as a member of a work unit	Yes	Usually

We assert that the assumption--what is good for the apprentice is good for the experienced teacher--is debilitating, because it limits the value of staff development to little more than professional ritual. We believe that the client populations for inservice and preservice education are very different. Mature professionals are different from students preparing for

their careers and neophytes trying to master basic skills and survive socialization into the profession. From our experiences of working with educators over the past several years, and from reading the work of adult development theorists, we have learned that mature professionals want something more than traditional professional training. Many of these teachers are past the halfway point in their careers and many already possess advanced degrees and lifetime certificates. They are seeking a much broader array of educational and self-awakening opportunities than are students or beginning teachers whose needs are different.

How Needs are Defined. A substantial amount of empirical research suggests that we should take the requirements, needs, and preferences of users or clients as the starting point for all staff development activities. We agree, but we take issue when procedures for assessing needs are inadequate and raise substantial moral questions.

As a group, teachers and administrators have many needs, and to define these needs requires, in part, a decision about what is "good." That decision rests on criteria implicit in questions such as, "What must I do to receive an increase in my salary?" "How may I improve my teaching of reading?" "How may I increase my job satisfaction?"

Because we live in socially complex environments, we are confronted by a multitude of "goods," some of which we may choose and others of which are forced upon us. While it is difficult enough for one individual to make choices, members of a group, such as a school's faculty, will find that they hold competing notions of what is "good." To translate their individual values into inservice needs requires a group decision. As a chagrined conference speaker lamented, "We had over ninety teachers indicate a real need for primary reading instruction on our needs assessment. We designed an inservice class specifically to meet this need and only three of the bastards showed up." We quote literally to indicate the presence of an ethical problem, and also to indicate that this speaker was not accurately in touch with how classroom teachers look upon inservice training as constituted. Obviously, the speaker was condemning teachers who sent him on a wild-goose chase that involved spending significant time and resources. "If not outright deceit, such teacher behavior is at least irresponsible," he fumed, vowing never again to be misled thusly. "They deserve all the problems they have," the moralist said as he rested his case.

In courts-martial there is a segment called "Extenuation and Mitigation" where certain facts are introduced to add context and reality to the problem being considered. We wish to introduce classroom "extenuating and mitigating" circumstances that, in our opinion, vitiate the present concept of needs assessment. We think that implications for a reconceptualized staff development model may be derived from some of the following realities about classroom teachers.

Needs Assessment and the Instrument. The following scenario depicts a typical needs assessment: The teaching day concluded, I flopped into my chair in the faculty room for a respite before confronting tomorrow's plan. While my wits were idling, I was handed a needs assessment form to fill out and return. It was no surprise that this needs assessment specified all of the topics available and asked me to rank order them. This format secretly pleased me, because I didn't have to invent all the possibilities; I had only to assign priorities to someone else's. I dutifully performed the ritual,

handed in the paper, and returned my thoughts to tomorrow's planning.

One problem implicit in the needs assessment described is that the teacher was asked to perform a self-diagnosis without knowing how. We refer the reader to Drummond's open letter on inservice education (1977). He contends that because people are unused to discussing their individual needs, they tend to be reluctant about sharing them. We think that Drummond's observation is valid. The point is that, for some reason, when we are asked for self-diagnosis of training needs, we are hesitant to communicate openly.

Needs Assessment and Choice. A further problem, perhaps too obvious to dwell on, is that every teacher in any needs assessment sampling is a veteran of at least sixteen years of institutionalization, of having his or her training needs assessed and prescribed by others. Predictably, needs assessors have provided a roster of possible choices and asked teachers for a ranking on the basis of their needs, but the consequences of this solution are many and risky. Teachers' responses may be suggested or cued by others; the choice that each teacher has ranked as number one is accorded absolute weight rather than the intended relative importance; a teacher may tend to respond as a representative of a group rather than as an individual, rationalizing that teachers at large may need instruction on reading techniques even though "I" do not, and knowing that the courses offered in response to the needs survey will be determined by which choice gets the most votes.

Needs Assessment and Time Lag. The link between a needs survey and a consequent inservice response is usually invisible and so stretched out in time that when, or if, the response is provided, teachers either have met their needs some other way or have developed more important needs in the meantime. The typical inservice mechanisms do not allow for timely response and trust building; rather they skip a dynamic period of refinement and initial diagnosis, and substitute a "don't call us, we'll call you" void.

Needs Assessment and Fad. In response to a typical assessment, teachers tend to make predictable choices that are derived not from their classroom experiences, but from whatever educational problem is currently receiving the most attention in the news media. For example, sex education is not a prominent inservice topic today, not because teachers feel no need for more competence, but because the topic has been replaced in the newspaper by the "Why Can't Johnny Read" debate. We think that the conference speaker noted earlier could have predicted that the majority of teachers responding to his needs survey would rank reading instruction number one as a perceived need. However, the cogent issue is when and whether they ever really felt the need.

Needs Assessment and the Philosophers' Stone. It was once believed that a philosophers' stone existed that had the power to transform base metals into gold. Chemists now dismiss such notions as being the simplistic fantasies of alchemists looking for shortcuts.

It is believed now that a needs assessment device exists which has the power to transform imperfect wishes into quality inservice education. Someday such notions will also be dismissed as the simplistic fantasies of staff development providers looking for shortcuts. Like the alchemists, staff development providers keep trying variations of the needs assessment idea in hopes that someone will stumble onto the perfect (or even an adequate) universal mechanism.

We cannot challenge the attractiveness of the needs assessment idea. If it could work successfully, a standard needs assessment device would resolve several serious dilemmas for staff development providers. It would objectively record the collective needs of an audience in a way that would simplify resource decisions, and its quantitative nature would be compatible with cultural and governmental notions of mechanistic cause and effect.

The needs assessment concept has become the perverse deus ex machina of teacher staff development. It holds out the promise of accuracy, rationality, collective equity, and comprehensibility, but it does not--it cannot--work as promised. It is a finite solution to a problem that is more often infinite. The needs assessment concept should become as infinite as the problem being diagnosed, that is, more qualitative, interactive, and personalized.

Staff Development Courses

The standard course, whether taught in a university classroom or at a school site (as now in vogue), is only one of many arrangements in which people can learn. However, much staff development is restricted to this delivery model, which is very much like the six o'clock evening news (Arends, Hersh, and Turner, 1978).

A child asked why there are always exactly thirty minutes of news each day. His view of reality implied that a newscaster should have only a few minutes worth of news on some evenings and perhaps two hours of substance for the audience on other evenings. He did not understand that something other than substance determined length.

When staff development training comes in prescribed packages, with an instructor, or tradition, determining both its calendar length and its substance breadth, many teachers find that the bulk of the content either does not apply to their situation or duplicates what they already know. This assertion is neither radical nor imprudent; it is the likely outcome of mass instruction designed for groups of individuals about whose backgrounds the trainer is essentially ignorant.

We think that a majority of classroom teachers' problems can be dealt with or solved by consultation, which requires far less investment than tuition and classes for eight weeks. Further, when teachers recognize that they need help, they don't want to be told to wait until the beginning of the next term to get that help, and then only if twelve or more similarly beleaguered teachers sign up.

Most staff development offerings are as predictable in length as the evening news, eight weeks, one evening per week, three hour per night, for three credit hours. This traditional arrangement determines the package for the training, and the job of the trainers is to fill the package even if they must resort to using excelsior. We are so accustomed to having the size and substance of staff development programs predetermined that we seldom question this practice.

Teachers and School Organization

To consider the teacher as individual client for staff development overlooks the school organization whose rules, norms, and structure may affect individual development. While we must attend to the individual, we must

account for the relationships between the individual and the organization, from work team or departmental level through the district structure. Changes in the patterns of interaction, goals, norms, rewards, rearrangement of space, new technology, testing, and politics within an organization create the needs for teachers to change simultaneously with organizational reshaping.

Nature of Schools

In Behind the Classroom Door (1970), Goodlad and Klein pointed out the inhibiting effects that schools as organizations have on teaching practices. Despite highly visible and well-funded organizational innovations, such as team teaching, open classrooms, modular scheduling, discovery learning, and individualized instruction, Goodlad and Klein concluded that the traditional graded school, with its commitments to grades, lower-order objectives, and convergent activities, continued to dominate the American scene.

They suggested two reasons why the extensive reform movements have barely touched American classrooms. First, organizational and social arrangements in schools have inhibited change by isolating teachers. Schools have not developed alternatives. Instead, they have opted for the prevailing system of education either from fear of public rebuke or from perceiving no need to change significantly what has worked before. Second, Goodlad and Klein blamed the training that teachers receive.

Joyce (1976) provided a cogent analysis of the institutional nature of the problem of teacher change:

> The life of the classroom teacher is a threat to his or her mental health when events are proceeding smoothly! To innovate in such a place is to court disaster. To innovate in inservice education will be no less hazardous than to change curriculum. The life of the teacher is so awful that anything additional overloads him/her almost immediately unless his/her conditions of life are changed substantially. (p. 13)

> I attribute the nature of teaching to the nature of its institutional life. We have to ask what can be done to those institutions to free people to become the creative decision makers which education would seem to require in its best senses. (p. 7)

The structure of the school as institution, Joyce stated, is highly resistant to the forces for change, especially forces emanating from outside the school. Time, for example, is one important variable required for personal growth, but from where in the school day is the time for staff development to come? Teachers may have good intentions, but their hectic professional lives prohibit meaningful incorporation of new information.

We argue that schools must be viewed as complex social systems, and we believe that important lasting educational improvement requires changes in the skills of individual educators. Everything considered, there is no good reason to believe that inservice education or staff development as commonly practiced will ever yield more than it now does. Until we adopt a new paradigm that is more complex, interactive, and responsive, inservice education will remain a negative element of the teacher's existence.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTS, RESEARCH, EXPERIENCES, HUNCHES

Staff development efforts can have more significant results than is usually the case. Four components--the nature of adult learners, organizational development, politics, and purposes--and their interrelationship hold the keys to improving staff development. This chapter summarizes relevant research and local experiences on the four components, and provides a basis for the twenty guidelines for effective staff development in the next chapter.

Nature of Adult Learners

Staff development providers and adult learners need to be able to "flex," to be reflexive about themselves as well as responsive to each other, during staff development activities, according to Hunt (1977). In his terms, traditional staff development is a linear theory-to-practice sequence of events. That is, a staff development provider describes and prescribes theory to a practitioner, who in turn delivers services to students. Embedded in this sequence are premises about roles (superordinate to subordinate), information flow (from theorist to practitioner to student), and information relevance (provider prescribes more information than the practitioner can use, and the provider, in turn, prescribes more than the students can use). Hunt claimed that this theorist-practitioner relationship provides the rationale for "teacher-proof" or context-free programs often recommended by staff development providers. Being human though, the teacher-practitioner brings into the delivery system his or her own context, which affects the flow from theorist to student. The view of teacher as passive recipient, expected to paint-by-numbers in applying inservice education, ignores the teacher's attitudes, learning-teaching style, and wealth of experiential knowledge.

Hunt urged us to discard the traditional theory-practice paradigm, and we concur fully. A linear, context-free delivery system abets the notion of finiteness and simple causality. To replace the model, Hunt suggested one of "persons-in-relation," which forces providers to view the teacher-practitioner as a person about whom the following reciprocal, diagnostic questions must be considered for any staff development effort: (1) Who is the person? (2) What does the person want? (3) What does the person believe? (4) What does the person know? (5) What can the person do? and (6) What is the person doing now? Hunt's model holds no hope for one-shot, or large-audience presentations except for inspiration.

Staff development providers must take into account not only each client's knowledge, but also his or her intentions, competence, beliefs, and actions. A provider should acknowledge that these features are integral to any staff development venture, along with the provider's intentions, competence, beliefs, actions, and so on. The effectiveness of staff development depends on the providers' and the clients' abilities to adapt and flex to each other. Adaptation is critical if we are to transform mechanical, irrelevant inservice education into responsive, relevant inservice education.

At the heart of the flex of persons-in-relation is a higher quality needs assessment called for in chapter one. Although none of the six diagnostic

questions uses the word "need," all yield essential information that must be considered before a need can be met.

Organizational Development

Adjusting our focus to the school organization in which teachers function, we find numerous facts and relationships that require not only attention, but also flex that is akin to flex at the individual level. Among the important dimensions embedded in school organizations are politics, interpersonal relationships, and school norms. The unacknowledged influence of these usually hinders staff development efforts in inverse proportion to the amount of attention paid them.

In many school improvement efforts, the common strategy is to accept the organizational arrangements as they exist and specify inservice training that presumably will change the individual educator. In contrast, substantial research has demonstrated that school improvement cannot be accomplished without attending to school culture and organization, which indicates that schools need to be developed as organizations (Miles, 1964; Sarason, 1971; Smith and Keith, 1971; Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Emrick, Peterson, and Argawala-Rogers, 1977; and Schmuck, Runkel, Arends, and Arends, 1977). An increasing amount of theory and practice has been developed to further this goal, and we believe it should be incorporated into inservice practices. Organizationally, rather than trying to improve isolated components of schools, training must aim toward helping people in schools come together and use the resources they possess in more effective, satisfying ways. The rationale that has evolved around this perspective (see Goodlad, 1975; Jung, 1977; Pino and Emory, 1977; Lohman and Wilson, 1977; Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends, 1977; and Arends and Arends, 1977) suggests that educators need to think about and practice how they communicate with one another to solve problems, make decisions, develop curricula, or whatever. Members of schools, in the same sense as athletic teams and symphony orchestras, need to practice ways to combine their skills in synergistic team efforts. Further, the organizational model recognizes that school improvement efforts do not necessarily occur quickly or linearly. Initial progress may be accompanied by setbacks. Organizational development is implicit in the guidelines for effective staff development listed in chapter three.

Politics of Staff Development

Although staff development is considered a legitimate activity, the resources available for it and the relative value assigned to it are subject to dispute. For example, a school board member might ask, "On what basis does a board justify spending 'x' amount of public funds on staff development or inservice training in lieu of alternative uses for such funds?" (Mallan, 1978, p. 219). Politics at all levels are involved. The federal government allocates funds through programs such as Teacher Centers and Teacher Corps. States receive federal funding and allocate their own monies for federal sets such as the Education of All Handicapped Children Act. State educational agencies set certification rules that necessitate staff development. Local education agencies not only mandate inservice education requirements, but also make known the salary schedules that reward persons for continuing

professional development. National, state, and local teacher organizations place high priority on staff development as a means for upgrading the teaching profession, but they consider it negotiable in the bargaining process. Individual teachers value staff development, although they may not be allowed to choose either the means or the ends for their staff development activities. These various actors create conflict and raise questions about the purposes and control of inservice education, which become issues of value differences and, ultimately, of power. In addition, there is no consensus on the questions of how much, for whom, for what purposes, and to what effect.

As Mann pointed out, change agents in schools have failed because they have applied educational methods to situations that are fundamentally political.

> The images most people have about the process of change are wrong. The common picture goes something like this: Congress passes a law and the feds build a network of research and development centers, laboratories, and networks that develop good programs pointed at real problems. The programs are purchased by a school system and delivered to the school building. The principal is photographed on the steps signing the receipt for delivery. The picture clearly shows the labels on the carton: "Lillian Weber's Open Corridors," "SRI's Reading Readiness Program," "Frank Brown's Ungraded Classrooms," or whatever. In the next frame, the custodian moves the cartons into the school and the teachers are T-grouped, workshopped, sensitized, staff developed, and otherwise "trained." The teachers take the cartons and their training back inside the classroom. And then what?
>
> It is fine to say that there has not been as much improvement as any of us would have wished. But the important question is "why not?" For one thing change does not come in boxes. In fact, the process of changing a school is a lot like the process of politics. Still, most of us understand that politics is about values. The political process determines who will get what kind of health care (and who won't), and who will pay for this health care and education (and who won't). (1978, p. 213)

Another level of politics is more subtle, but equally powerful--the politics of the classroom. Ultimately, staff development is aimed at teacher and pupil change, and classrooms are the political units of change. Each classroom represents its own political society, as Mann amplified in his explanation of inservice politics:

> We all know that classrooms have a "constitution"--a patterned way for teachers and children to interact. That constitution governs what the children can do and, especially, what they can't. The constitution of most classrooms gives executive, legislative, and judicial power to the teacher. And for most classrooms there is no Bill of Rights except for the teacher.
>
> Now, in light of the usual constitution of the classrooms, consider the words we use to describe recent innovations in education: humane, open, child-centered, individually prescribed, learner-paced, teacher-facilitated, and peer-mediated. All those words imply a profound transformation in the authority structure of

the classroom. Professors and superintendents can talk about terms like "innovation," "improvement," and "renewal," but the teachers know that it is their authority structure we are trifling with. It is their power that is being shared with children, their professional autonomy that is being diminished, and their personal and professional self-identity that is being questioned. (1978, p. 213)

Staff development is clearly a political issue. For providers to function productively with clients, strategies must be available to deal with the political variables of value difference and resource allocation. The history of staff development is littered with change efforts that failed to plan politically in addition to pedagogically. Also, the purpose of staff development is often a result of a political process, not an educational one. "Classroom management" or "middle school discipline," for example, are derived as current inservice topics from the political climates of the communities around the schools. After recognizing the source of a need and its political components, the staff development provider should assist both clients and resource gatekeepers to clarify the purposes of each inservice event; to tailor activities, if possible, to serve a variety of interests; and to acquire sufficient resources for inservice programs.

Purposes of Staff Development

A variety of staff development purposes, often politically determined, means that different delivery systems are needed to meet different objectives. For any staff development activity, purpose influences the quality of needs assessment, governance, definition of competence, and role of each constituent.

Drummond (1979) classified staff development purposes into the following typologies:

Job Maintenance. In this category, mandates from the legislature or the school board, strong suggestions from the supervising principal or department chairman, or direct feedback from students or parents suggest that additional training or remediation is needed. Again, courses, conferences, workshops, consultants and, on occasion, a clinical psychologist or counselor may be available. Sometimes job maintenance offerings are provided by the professional organization.

Personal Development. Here the individual seeks refreshment, renewal, revitalization, a change of pace, a sense of wholeness and worth. Colleges of education don't seem to make it here; sometimes community colleges do through adult education programs in art, music, dance, crafts. Personally, I usually look to special societies or organizations like EST, Lifespring, National Training Laboratories, or religious or philosophical societies, or community interest clubs, or just fishing up in Northern Idaho. Only once in my career have I been asked to offer an education course for a group of citizens for no credit, just for the fun of it; parenthetically, we had a ball!

Problem Solving. Here a problem or several problems (or

concerns) are identified; that is, problems are found in the building and defined by people in the building (see Gene Hall's work at the Texas R & D Center). I see at least three problem-solving types:

> Type A I call a linkage type. Here an outsider whom insiders trust helps the insiders define their problem or problems and works with them through to the resolution of the problem(s), relying heavily on outside research and development. This is sometimes called technical assistance.
>
> Type B I call a situational learning type. Here the people at the site come to the realization that there are no outside solutions or options which will solve their problem. Using their own skills and those of outsiders whom they trust, they carry out an action research project until they understand the problem's nature and context so that they then can resolve it.
>
> Type C I call a problem management type. Here the people in the building realize that the problem or problems they have cannot be solved or resolved without major changes in the larger system or until deep-seated organizational norms are changed. Here the group tries to understand the organizational set from which problems arise; they try to determine which problems are attended to and which ignored; they try to understand the nature of participation in the organization; and they examine the vital signs of the organization in the determining of its health and prognosis. (p. 14)

On the basis of Drummond's typologies the following four categories are proposed:

Staff Development for School Improvements--Locally Derived. Teachers identify aspects of their school's program that need to be improved. These may range from the way students are instructed in the basic skills, to the way they are to behave on the playground. Improvement efforts may focus on how groups are used for instruction, or they may address how best to create a nourishing environment that develops self-esteem.

To accomplish these improvement efforts, local educators may decide that they need new understandings and skills, so staff development activities are planned. For example, elementary school faculty may invite an expert on direct instruction to provide training on that method of teaching. Another faculty may ask an organizational development consultant to assist with understanding group dynamics and studying ways that groups can be used for instruction. Or, faculty may visit a neighboring school to inspect a new program on promoting self-concept, and invite two teachers from that school to train them on the techniques and procedures for that program. The common variable in these staff development efforts is that they serve the teachers at the building level in response to a local problem.

Staff Development for School Improvement--Externally Derived. The education system in this country allows many persons and groups--citizens,

professionals, parents, and lawmakers--a say in what goes on in schools. Externally derived reform and corresponding staff development activities might occur as follows: A group of interested persons approach a local school board, state legislature, or federal agency, and point out that schools are lacking in some aspect of their program or mission. Through political persuasion and popular support for a cause, policy is adopted or legislation passed. The new policy or lesiglation often requires professionals in schools to change their behavior. Policy makers tend to think that inservice education will aid the change effort.

Recent examples of this kind of reform include policy assertions by local boards that schools should attend more to the basics, state legislation that requires career education and competency-based education, and federal mandates that require equal opportunities for women and greater access for handicapped children. The common variable behind externally derived staff development activities is the aim to solve problems that groups within the larger society express, but that local teachers and educators do not necessarily understand how to put into practice.

Staff Development for Keeping Up With New Knowledge and Skills. Knowledge about teaching, learning, and schooling increases continuously, at a fairly rapid pace. For example, it is impossible today for teachers who were trained in reading instruction twenty years ago to have sufficient undertandings to teach in a modern elementary school, or for administrators who studied management concepts a decade ago to be effective without exposure to more current theories and research on team management and organizational development. To move from research to practice requires sustained effort, part of which includes reading professional journals and attending conferences. However, much of the transition requires more concentrated efforts such as special classes, workshops, or seminars where new research is presented with opportunities to apply it to individual situations. In this kind of staff development no specific reform or improvement is being sought or encouraged; instead, the common purpose is to assist the practitioner to seek information and other resources. These can be applied to day-to-day work, to solve generic educational problems, and to ensure that current methods of instruction and schooling are being used properly.

Staff Development for Lifelong Learning and Renewal. The fourth purpose of staff development is to promote lifelong learning. Activities in this category have the common attributes of voluntary selection and participation. Individuals pursue these activities for one or more of the following personal motivations: (1) achievement of professional or personal goals, valued by the individual; (2) power to affect one's personal future; and (3) affiliation with others who share similar interests.

A cursory reading of our four purposes of staff development might lead to a conclusion that only one of them, the "externally derived" category, is politically derived. Anyone ready to accept that conclusion is invited to review the other three categories with special reference to the political questions of resource allocation and individually held values.

Summary

Effective staff development interrelates four components--clients, organization, politics, and purposes. To those who approach staff development from the narrow point of view of one component, we suggest examining the whole from as many different angles as possible. We stress the need to understand the relational nature of staff development, and to avoid the pressure to reduce its problems to simple parts in search of a perfect solution.

A caveat is in order about the next chapter's guidelines on planning and evaluating effective staff development activities. Although we believe that these guidelines can help, we caution that there is no guarantee of success. As in teaching, there is an art to combining the elements to meet individual needs. We believe that regardless of the elegance of inservice purposes or delivery models, the success of many efforts will hinge on the human relationships between clients and providers.

CHAPTER III

GUIDELINES FOR INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Although little systematic inquiry has been conducted on inservice education per se, a substantial amount of theory and practice from related fields can provide a sufficient empirical base for planning and implementing inservice teacher education. This chapter summarizes twenty guidelines for effective staff development. These guidelines are not pat answers to everyone's problems, but we believe they can be of assistance.

Our frame of reference for staff development draws upon four areas of research and practice: adult learning theory, human interaction, organizational development, and planned change. For each, we present some of the main ideas and evidence.

Nature of Adult Learners

From adult learning theory, three guidelines can be derived for staff development.

GUIDELINE #1: Recognize that adults are personally motivated, as are people of all ages, to achieve, to influence their fate, and to affiliate with others.

We have found that staff development clients will remain motivated and responsive if they experience success rather than failure, if they can influence what they do, and if they experience friendship and camaraderie rather than aloneness and rejection. This means that staff development events should strive to allow experiences that lead to skills mastery and observable competence, to provide ample opportunity for participants to contribute to content and process, and to make time for meaningful exchange with other participants and the providers.

GUIDELINE #2: Help the mature professionals integrate work, education, and leisure into training and consulting with peers.

Mature professionals want more than new understandings and skills for their teaching repertoire. They seek new ways to use the knowledge and skills they already possess. They look for staff development programs that give them career options as trainers and consultants by increasing their ability to work with others. As adult learners, they also seek ways to integrate work, education, and leisure into staff development. We think this goal is particularly true for professionals who restructure their jobs, take sabbaticals, and the like to achieve that kind of integration.

GUIDELINE #3: Act as a colleague rather than a critic of your adult clients and work with them in supporting ways.

Many times staff development providers from a school district's central office or from a university serve as critics. Their messages say that curricula are dull, and that teachers are unimaginative conformists who are unresponsive to the needs and demand for change. Although social criticism may serve a valuable purpose, it does not ingratiate staff development providers with their clients. The effective provider, in our view, should stand for reform and change, but should be cautious in laying blame for present situations. Teachers have spent many years providing education in ways that make sense to them and that support prior norms and roles.

Human Interaction

In most staff development activities, the quality of the human relationships between those helping and those being helped determines success or failure. The seven guidelines in this section are based on studies from several fields including teaching, nursing, social work, counseling, and ministry.

GUIDELINE #4: Recognize that there is no best technique of providing help.

Combs (1969) and Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1978) found that there is no one best method for giving help to another person. Techniques and results vary from helper to helper and from situation to situation. However, it seems that the general attitude that a helper brings to a relationship accounts for most of the difference between effective and ineffective help.

GUIDELINE #5: Work from the client's frame of reference.

Various words--sensitivity, empathy, concern--have been used to describe the idea of seeing things from the client's point of view (Rogers, 1969; Carkhoff and Berenson, 1977). The message is that effective staff development providers realize that it is difficult and often painful to learn new understanding and skills. For example, many teachers required to work with a handicapped child for the first time may feel nervous and insecure. Staff development providers can be more helpful if they work from the teacher's perspective of the problem, and not from the perspective of the people who were responsible for the legislation.

GUIDELINE #6: Respond promptly to client needs and concerns.

Good helpers take the requirements, needs, and preferences of clients as a starting point for staff development activities

and respond as quickly as possible. Increasing evidence indicates that it is impossible to have successful staff development programs or to help educators make significant and lasting school improvements unless requests come from the clients themselves, unless clients have been involved in identifying and resolving their problems, and unless the providers can react promptly and responsively. Combs (1969) suggested that the provider's ability as a prompt, responsive helper rests on beliefs about the helping relationship, and on abilities to diagnose client needs and design activities.

GUIDELINE #7: Work in causative ways with clients.

Research suggests that good helpers see themselves in causative ways (Combs, 1969; and DeCharms, 1968). That is, helpers have self-confidence and believe that what they do makes things happen. When providing staff development, they communicate that they believe their clients have the capacity to handle their own problems.

As we have described, the point of view and general attitude that providers hold about their clients is important; equally important as the way that providers involve clients in staff development activities.

GUIDELINE #8: Give teachers active roles in staff development activities.

From the work of Lawrence (1974) and from our experiences, we hold that staff development activities in which teachers develop classroom materials and learn by doing are more likely to succeed than activities in which the teacher is only a recipient. A successful approach involves four steps: The learner enters a new experience; reflects on the significance of the experience; synthesizes a logic, theory, or conceptual framework to give order to the experience and observations; and applies the new knowledge to decisions and problems.

GUIDELINE #9: Provide activities that emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials, feedback, and classroom follow-up.

A major objective of many staff development activities is to help teachers perform new skills. For example, newer reading programs require teachers to exhibit specific behaviors when instructing a class. We have found that teachers learn specific behaviors, such as communication skills, more quickly and surely when the staff development instructors can demonstrate and model a behavior, and then provide a simulated setting in which a teacher can try out the new behavior and receive feedback. Simulations offer psychological safety for the teacher in that the risk of making mistakes is minimized. Feedback points out mistakes and further trial prepares the teacher to try the new behavior in the classroom.

GUIDELINE #10: Show teachers how to monitor their teaching behavior and analyze the effects.

Among the most important results of staff development is increased ability to continue learning about oneself. According to Witherell and Erickson (1978):

> . . . increased complexity in one's understanding of self and the capacity to imagine multiple alternatives, typical of the higher stages of ego development, probably increases one's behavioral options and coping strategies. In addition, because the more advanced stages of ego development are characterized by increased flexibility, differentiation of feelings, respect for individuality, tolerance for conflict and ambiguity, the cherishing of interpersonal ties, and a broader social perspective, advancement in ego development would appear to stand on its own as educationally desirable for both teachers and students. (p. 232)

> Two vehicles for attaining this knowledge (of human development and relationships) are observation and interviewing of children and adolescents of different ages in such areas as cognitive, moral, and social role-taking development. Inservice education has the advantage of having its clients (in this case teachers) in an ongoing laboratory setting (the classroom) where such study can be in continuous progress. Along with skills and practice, teachers need the opportunity to share and discuss what they learn--colleagueship. Teaching can no longer afford to be a function of an isolated individual professional, but rather has to take place within a cooperative team network where people talk to one another and learn from one another. (p. 239)

> A further task of teacher education--one that is perhaps equally important to the teacher's understanding of the child--is the teacher's understanding of self. Our experience has been that there is a reciprocal relationship between role-taking experiences (taking the perspective of others) and a more complex, integrated understanding of the self. Inservice education programs can capitalize on this reciprocity by using such procedures as video playback interviews, where teachers are given the opportunity to reflect on the nature and meaning of their interactions with students (accurately recalled through video playback) in the context of their stated goals and intentions. Through this process, teachers are encouraged to not only imagine what their students were experiencing,

but also to review their own experiences and hypothesize alternatives for their behavior in given situations. (p. 237)

Organizational Development

Perhaps the toughest problem in staff development is providing activities for personal, professional growth, while recognizing that individual needs exist in the context of work units or groups. We believe that important, lasting educational improvements require changes in the norms and structures of schools as much as changes in the skills of individual educators. The following five guidelines apply to organizational development:

GUIDELINE #11: Plan staff development activities so they are tied to school efforts rather than problems identified by districts or colleges and universities.

Teachers and other school personnel are more likely to benefit from staff development activities that are part of a total school staff or organization development plan. Two contrasting examples illustrate this idea. In one school, after noting low achievement scores in reading, the principal and some of the teachers thought that something should be done to improve the school's reading program. The principal talked to the district's right-to-read coordinator and decided the teachers would benefit from a course on reading in the content areas. The coordinator found a course at a nearby university and made arrangements for tuition to be paid for teachers who wanted to enroll. The principal encouraged the teachers to take the course. In a neighboring school, the principal and several teachers also recognized that something needed to be done about low student achievement in reading. However, they formed a larger committee of teachers who collected information about the school's reading program and about instruction being provided by each teacher. The committee found that no consistent program existed and concluded that they should adopt a common approach to reading. Their search for reading programs that had been successful in other schools identified several alternatives. The entire faculty decided on and proceeded to adapt the approach that best matched their student population. They could see that new skills were required, so they arranged for the whole staff to be trained by a reading specialist from the university and a teacher who had prior experience in a neighboring district with the new program. The latter example, we think, has a better chance for success because the inservice is tied closely to a school problem and all staff have helped to shape the solution.

GUIDELINE #12: Tie staff development to the regular work of teachers including ongoing work group and faculty meetings.

Time for teachers to participate in training is another staff development problem. Although it may always be a problem, research (Berman et al., 1975; and Emrick et al., 1977) supports the contention that staff development tied to participants' classroom work and to regular meetings with peers can be more effective than special events, workshops or classes. A useful pattern we have found is to meet frequently with teachers at their work site to identify staff development purposes and activities; proceed with a workshop, and follow up with on-site visits to discuss problems or to observe classroom interaction and provide feedback.

GUIDELINE #13: Match the delivery system with the objective(s).

In a national survey, teachers were asked about whom they generally perceive as the most effective instructors for the various kinds of inservice education described in this paper. The survey showed that teachers differentiate according to the staff development objective. Other teachers and school-related personnel were seen as more appropriate for on-the-job objectives, but professors were preferred for objectives concerned with obtaining a new credential, preparing for a career change within education, and acquiring new knowledge about teaching in general and personal development (Howey and Joyce, 1978). In a related finding, a Rand study suggested that at least for change related to specific school, classroom, and individual teacher concerns, the most effective help came either from professional colleagues or from university personnel whose positions had been embedded in the school setting for a long time.

GUIDELINE #14: Recognize that a principal's support is critical for school-level change.

We agree with Mann's analysis of the principal's role in school improvement:

> Every project identified the system's principals as a critical force. Only one project even attempted to buck the principals, entering schools and conducting a training session on the authority of the superintendent, a practice that lasted until the principals' association forced the board to rescind the superintendent's authority! More commonly, the project announced the districtwide availability of its services in tones of muted assertiveness, but when the trainers crossed the school's threshold they worked with teachers chosen by the principal, on problems identified by the principal and with the success determined by the principal. More happily,

> principals sometimes exercise plenary power to reinforce the project. But, since change is almost necessarily a challenge to authority, that was rare. In those few cases where principals did support the projects, the changes were as swift and dramatic as a proposal writer's fondest dream. (1978, p. 215)

GUIDELINE #15: Approach staff development as an extension of what teachers already know, rather than from the point of view of assumed deficiency.

Traditionally staff development has followed a "deficiency model"--fix up the teacher. The nature of preservice preparation, the conditions within organizational school life, the expectations placed on educators by the public, and the increasing number of external mandates requiring educational change are reason enough to recognize the impossibility of the teaching role. To burden that role with an assumed inherent deficiency does an injustice to the potential and motivation for further professional growth.

GUIDELINE #16: Expectations and evaluation criteria for any staff development activity must be demanding.

The Rand study suggested that projects where expectations were high were the most successful in creating significant change. The term "Mickey Mouse" is one of the most often heard complaints about both preservice and inservice education. From an adult development point of view, the notion of significant cognitive challenge is crucial. Structural development, the reorganization of how one thinks about a set of ideas, requires breaking away from the old view, which is usually a long-term process of consistent challenge to what is already believed.

Planned Change

In the field of planned change, theorists and practitioners have amassed evidence to strongly suggest that significant change of social institutions requires long-term, systematic efforts that include careful planning and implementation. Contributions from this field include a definition of the provider-client relationship and its phases or steps that should be followed in an intervention or inservice effort. Although several variations of these phases are adequate, we prefer the process of change for school improvement to include the six steps of: entry, diagnosis, design, implementation, follow-up, and assessment.

GUIDELINE #17: Recognize that most staff development efforts start with an initial entry to a client group, move through phases of diagnosing needs, and designing and delivering training, and are completed with follow-up and evaluation.

Entry. In our view, every staff development event begins with providers and clients contacting one another and negotiating agreements on goals and activities. Sometimes this contact is brief, perhaps an hour or so for a two- or three-day workshop, and at other times the negotiations may take as long as six months. Regardless of the time it takes (most inservice providers underestimate the actual time needed), what happens during the initial contact and meetings with clients is critical to what follows.

Diagnosis. Diagnosis is the process of figuring out what the client wants and needs, but there are many problems (Arends, Hersh, and Turner, 1978). Most people are reluctant to communicate needs openly and clearly to others; there often is a time lag between formal needs assessment and an actual inservice event; and often diagnosis produces only the results that the gatekeepers for the inservice activities desire. A staff development provider should recognize these pitfalls, use multiple methods of collecting information, and always remain alert to the problems from the client's point of view.

Design. The provider makes plans before and during inservice activities that include the larger overall purposes and strategies (macrodesign) and the more detailed objectives of particular events (microdesign). Our experience tells us that the time providers put into staff development design often spells the difference between success or failure.

Implementation. Providers and clients come face-to-face in a workshop or some other instructional or work setting to reach the goals set forth in the design and diagnosis.

Follow-up. In the past, inservice events have too often been one-shot or hit-and-run events. We believe that follow-up of all training or consultation is critical if the purposes of the inservice training are to be achieved. During follow-up sessions with clients in their own classrooms or faculty meetings, the staff development provider can assist with the application of skills to real-life situations.

Evaluation. Although evaluation is placed last sequentially, it as an ongoing process. Evaluation data should be collected and fed back into the overall process during every phase.

Cyclical Nature of Planned Change

For clarity, we described the phases of planned change as if they were a logical, linear process. In reality, the process does not work that way. The various phases overlap for most inservice events of any length, and the phases are more cyclical than linear.

GUIDELINE #18: Engage teachers in planning the staff development program and invite them to work as helpers and trainers in activities.

In an extensive survey of the research on inservice education, Lawrence (1974) reported that programs in which teachers share, provide mutual assistance, and work as co-trainers and helpers are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs in which teachers work alone to accomplish the work assigned by college or central office staff development personnel. Our experience supports this contention. We have found that inservice and staff development strategies such as "turn key" training, where a small group of teachers are trained and, in turn, train others; and cadre development, where a permanent group of teachers is trained to consult with and train their peers, are especially effective. These strategies are effective and economical, and they provide teachers a chance to work with other adults--a circumstance not usually available in the day-to-day life of a classroom teacher.

GUIDELINE #19: Attempt to create conditions in which staff volunteer for training.

The Rand studies showed that the most successful projects were those in which participants were not coerced into participation. Mann made the following point on the nature of the nonvolunteer audience:

> As a whole, teachers must try to perform virtually impossible tasks with a technology that is inadequate or simply wrong. Defensiveness and secretiveness are understandable attitudes where the circumstances demand a professional, pedagogical role performance even though there is no sufficient knowledge about what causes good teaching and learning. Also, because teachers recognize that they are supposed to perform intellectual tasks, and because their intellect is clearly on display in most kinds of professional interaction (especially in training sessions), the safest performance is the least performance. Thus, to guard themselves from negative evaluation, they simply clammed up. It is hard to train clams. (1978, p. 215)

GUIDELINE #20: Maximize the use of peer support.

Lawrence and Branch (1978) reported that the use of peer support is important to effective staff development. Their work in the formation of peer panel procedures is a good example of this guideline:

> What is a peer panel and how does it work? It is a group of three to five teachers who give each other

assistance and support in a variety of ways, mainly to help each member improve in teaching ability. Successful peer panels have followed these support guidelines rather closely:

--Members freely choose each other.
--There are no superordinate-subordinate relationships in the peer panel.
--What is discussed in the peer panel is private to its members except as agreed by all its members.
--Members avoid evaluating each other in the usual sense; rather they follow procedures for giving and receiving low inference feedback.
--A peer panel tries to work only with an agenda that is above the table.
--Empathy and mutual support are the tones for a peer panel, not detachment and inspection.

Working within these guidelines, what does a peer panel try to accomplish? It has two broad objectives: (a) to serve as an informal support group for sharing, letting off steam, discussing problems, etc.; and (b) to be a vehicle for the continuing professional development of its members. As peer panels work toward the second objective, the members assist each other, individually and collectively, in several ways:

--They act as a sounding board for one another's self-analysis of needs, and for ideas and plans for improvement;
--They assist each other in analyzing teaching and curriculum, often by systematic observing in each others' classrooms--using low-inference measures;
--They give one another low-inference feedback on behavior observed or work analyzed; and
--They verify "for the record," if a record of competency development is needed, the member's attaining of an objective in his/her improvement plan. (1978, p. 246)

Future successful staff development efforts, we believe, will (1) rely on a variety of information sources, (2) allow for many different attitudes, (3) provide for long chains of events, and (4) have the willingness of clients and providers to flex with unplanned problems. Future agents should recognize the growing independence of client systems and acknowledge that no single linear or one-dimensional model will suffice.

We propose that inservice education should provide for synergism--the overall effect becoming greater than the sum of the interactive components.

CHAPTER IV

IMAGES AND ORGANIZATION FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Our most striking observation of current staff development programs is their diversity and lack of coordination. School districts, state departments of education, institutions of higher education, regional and local educational agencies, and all other participants in staff development often take a win-lose stance toward each other. Each remains more concerned about financial support, student credit hours, and political power than about a coordinated response to the needs of educators and schools. We contend that before delivery modes emerge, we must create totally different organizational mechanisms for funding and delivering staff development programs.

Local Education Agencies

Each school district or local education agency (LEA) will need to establish internal units to coordinate staff development activities and to link with outside agencies. Some larger districts have internal units already in place, but most do not. The locally governed teacher center movement is a step in the right direction and should provide more local direction for staff development. Many resources and services can be made available through the type of centers described by Devaney (1977), but we think these will be insufficient unless they are tied to districtwide efforts and linked to other agencies at least on a regional basis.

Another function of LEA staff development units will be to responsively solve problems unique to the district. For example, within a state, one district might emphasize reorienting teachers to work in middle schools, while another district emphasizes strengthened roles for parent councils. Probably, no other agency can fulfill this function.

State Education Agencies

State education agencies (SEAs) will need to expand their role in some aspects of staff development and pull back in others. Because of SEA's regulatory functions, we think it unlikely that they can provide responsive staff development programs of the kind we have described. However, we do think they can take the lead in funding local staff development activities and in finding imaginative ways to combine staff development, lifelong learning, and credentialing.

Many potentially useful staff development activities are stymied because of inadequate financial support. Joyce (1976) reported that although millions are spent on inservice, most of the money goes piecemeal to uncoordinated, ineffective efforts. We contend that SEAs must assume leadership for acquiring financial resources for staff development activities. These resources are necessary not only to finance the services provided, but more importantly to finance the released time that teachers need to participate during the school day.

Through the SEAs, including licensing agencies, states can provide leadership in the area of teacher credentialing. Although many might wish

things to be different, education probably will remain "credential conscious" in the years ahead. Licensing agencies will continue to use a credit system to control membership into teaching and school administration, and teachers and administrators will continue to gain credits for professional advancement and monetary rewards.

In most states the credentialing process involves both a state agency that specifies requirements, and colleges of education that establish a credit system and deliver courses for credit. Trends suggest that states want more guarantees of standardized subject matter and procedures so that credits earned from one place are comparable to those earned from another. On the other hand, practicing educators want programs that meet their needs. Caught in the middle, colleges of education have tended to grant credit only for work completed on campus and experiences that generate student credit hours.

We believe that states, as some are demonstrating, can reverse this trend and revise their requirements for renewing credentials. The credentialing process should reward staff development activities that directly relate to the lifelong learning goals of individual educators and to agreed upon school improvement efforts.

Institutions of Higher Education

Schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) within institutions of higher education (IHEs) need to set a higher priority for staff development activities, create units to coordinate outreach activities, and find ways to grant credit for experiential learning.

A higher priority will require SCDEs to rearrange the traditional research, teaching, and service trinity, so that service equals the other functions. It will require change in the ways that people in SCDEs see themselves and their work, and in the ways that others see them.

As with districts, we contend that SCDEs need to create special units for inservice education and staff development. These units should be integrated within the SCDE, its IHE, and with other IHEs in the region and state. The functions of such a unit might include: initiating inservice and staff development offerings on and off campus; assisting local, state, and national policy groups to reform goals; initiating leadership training for other staff development providers; coordinating regionwide networks of inservice and staff development agencies, and studying the process of school improvement through inservice training and staff development. We also envision such a unit engaging in what Heffernan, Macy, and Vickers (1976) labeled "educational brokering," that is, making available career and staff development guidance services to help educators identify their learning needs and to assist them in seeking out experiences within a state or region that could help meet their needs.

Finally, SCDEs need to find ways to appraise professional competence gained through life experience, and to grant academic credit for it. We believe that portfolio and testing procedures similar to those developed by the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning Project (Keeton, 1976) could be used.

Changing the Images

The future we have described will require actors in each of the educational institutions to change the images they have of themselves and the images they hold about others. For example, teachers, administrators, and professionals of all kinds in local education agencies will need to understand that they can take charge of their destinies, become more resourceful in solving their problems, and be more quality conscious when procuring outside assistance. Personnel in state education agencies will need to view as top priorities their jobs of educating their publics about the importance of inservice education and staff development, and of building a financial system that supports lifelong learning for educators. Finally, faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education will need to admit to themselves and convince others that they are responsible not only for producing new knowledge, but also for engaging in its creative synthesis, transformation, and transmission into practice for use by preservice trainees and working professionals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works Cited

Arends, Richard I., and Arends, Jane H. Systems Change Strategies in Education. New Vistas in Counseling Series, edited by Garry R. Walz and Libby Benjamin, vol. 3. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1977.

Arends, Richard I.; Hersh, Richard; and Turner, Jack. "Inservice Education and the Six O'Clock News." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):196-205.

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, M. W. The Findings in Review. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, vol. 4. Santa Monica, Calif: Rand Corporation, 1975.

Carkhoff, R., and Berenson, B. Teaching as Treatment. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press, 1977.

Combs, A. W. Florida Studies in the Helping Professions. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1969.

Combs, A. W.; Avila, D. L.; and Purkey, W. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

DeCharms, Richard. Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Devaney, Kathleen. "The Informal Work Place: An Approach to Teachers' Centers." In Teacher Centers, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report on the Education Professions 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977. HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-12012.

Drummond, William H. "Components of an Effective Inservice Delivery System." National Council of States on Inservice Education Inservice, April 1979, p. 14.

Drummond, William H. "An Open Letter to the Dean RE Inservice Education." Mimeographed. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida, 1977.

Emrick, J. A.; Peterson, S. M.; and Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network. Vols. 1 and 2. Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

Fullan, Michael, and Pomfret, Alan. "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation." Review of Educational Research, Winter 1977, pp. 335-97.

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Change in Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Goodlad, John I., and Klein, M. F. Behind the Classroom Doo_. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

Heffernan, J. M.; Macy, F. V.; and Vickers, D. F. Educational Brokering: A New Service for Adult Learners. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Center for Educational Brokering, 1976.

Howey, Kenneth, and Joyce, Bruce. "A Data Base for Future Directions in Inservice Education." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):206-11.

Hunt, David E. "Teacher Centers as Persons-in-Relations." Paper presented at Conference on Teacher Centers, 1977, at the University of Chicago. Mimeographed.

Joyce, Bruce. "Structural Imagination and Professional Staff Development." Palo Alto, Calif.: Booksend Laboratories, 1976.

Jung, Charles. Organization Development in Schools. Portland, Ore.: Commercial Educational Distributors, 1977.

Keeton, Morris T., and associates. Experiential Learning: Rationale, Characteristics, and Assessment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. Tallahassee, Fla.: State Dept. of Education, 1974.

Lawrence, Gordon, and Branch, Jan. "Peer Support System as the Heart of Inservice Education." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):245-47.

Lohman, J., and Wilson, G. Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1977.

Mallan, John T. "Philodoxy: The Promise of Inservice." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):218-28.

Mann, Dale. "The Politics of Inservice." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):212-17.

Miles, Matthew. Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1964.

Pino, R. F., and Emory, R. E. Preparing Educational Training Consultants, I, II, and III. Portland, Ore.: Commercial Educational Distributors, 1977.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schmuck, Richard A.; Runkel, Phillip J.; Arends, Jane H.; and Arends, Richard I. School Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Press, 1977.

Smith, Louis M., and Keith, Pat M. Anatomy of Educational Innovation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Witherell, Carol S., and Erickson, V. Lois. "Teacher Education as Adult Development." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):229-38.

For Further Reading

Argyris, Chris, and Schon, Donald A. Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Drummond, William H., and Lawrence, Gordon D. "A Letter to Harry on Site Specific Inservice Education." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):272-78.

Emrick, John A., and Peterson, Susan M. "A Synthesis of Findings Across Five Recent Studies of Educational Dissemination and Change." Mimeographed. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.

Fullan, Michael. "Overview of the Innovative Process and the User." Interchange 3 (1972):1-46.

Hunt, David E. "Inservice Training as Persons-in-Relation." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):239-44.

Joyce, Bruce R.; Howey, Kenneth R.; and Yarger, Sam J. Inservice Teacher Education. Vols. 1-5. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

Kurland, N. D. "A National Strategy for Lifelong Learning." Phi Delta Kappan. February 1978, pp. 379-85.

Lickona, Thomas. "Helping Teachers Become Moral Educators." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):258-66.

Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen." Teachers College Record 77 (February 1976):313-22.

Moore, Donald C.; Schepers, E. M.; Holmes, M. L.; and Blair, K. A. Assistance Strategies of Six Groups that Facilitate Educational Change at the School/Community Level. Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1977.

Rosenshine, Barak, and Meyers, Linda. "Staff Development for Teaching Basic Skills." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):267-71.

Sarason, Seymour B. "Community Psychology, Networks, and Mr. Everyman." American Psychologist 31 (1976):317-28.

Schein, Edgar H. Professional Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Sieber, S. D.; Louis, K. S.; and Metzner, L. The Use of Educational Knowledge: Evaluation of the Pilot State Dissemination Programs. Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1972.

Yarger, Sam J., and Yarger, Gwendolynne P. "And So We Asked Ourselves--About Teacher Centers." Theory Into Practice 17 (June 1978):248-57.